

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/081,705	10/081,705 02/21/2002		John Barthelow Classen	22499-68466	1273
23973	7590	08/18/2006		EXAMINER	
DRINKER	BIDDL	E & REATH	LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE		
		UAL PROPERTY GI	ROUP		
ONE LOGAN SQUARE				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
18TH AND	CHERR	Y STREETS	2161		
PHILADEL	PHIA, P	A 19103-6996	DATE MAILED: 08/18/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/081,705	CLASSEN, JOHN BARTHELOW				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Etienne P LeRoux	2161				
The MAILING DA	TE of this communication appo	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE MAILING DATE OF  Extensions of time may be avairafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the  If the period for reply specified a  If NO period for reply is specified  Failure to reply within the set or	THIS COMMUNICATION.  Itable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 mailing date of this communication.  above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply d above, the maximum statutory period wi extended period for reply will, by statute, a later than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH( 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI date of this communication, even if timely filed	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to cor	I)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 July 2006</u> .						
2a) This action is FINA	AL. 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4a) Of the above of 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>201-213</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/	<ul> <li>✓ Claim(s) 201-213 and 215-251 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>✓ Claim(s) 201-213 and 215-251 is/are rejected.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> </ul>						
Application Papers							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) file Applicant may not re Replacement drawin	equest that any objection to the d	: : a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objecte lrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj aminer. Note the attached Office	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)			•				
1) Notice of References Cited (	PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) D Notice of Draftsperson's Pat	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ment(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

Art Unit: 2161

#### Claim Status:

Claims 201-213 and 215-251 are pending: claims 1-200 have been cancelled and claim 214 has been omitted. Claims 201-213 and 215-251 are rejected as detailed below.

## Claim Objections

Claims 215 through 246 are objected to because claim 214 has been omitted. Numbering of the claims needs to addressed.

Claims 247-249 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 247-249 depend from cancelled claim 33.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 201-213 and 215-251 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps of claim 1 are:

- (1) the steps required to analyze the data to identify one new essential adverse event
- (2) the steps required for commercializing of the new adverse event information
- (3) the method of identifying new essential adverse event information for a product or device

Art Unit: 2161

Examiner maintains the scope of the invention is difficult to determine because of the above missing method steps. Claim 201 comprises a preamble with no body in which the invention is positively claimed.

Page 3

The independent claims of the claimed invention are rejected for at least being dependent from a rejected base claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 201-213 and 215-251 of the claimed invention are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The present invention is directed to the judicial exception of natural phenomena. Analyzing possible adverse interactions between drugs and possible adverse interactions between hazardous materials is the consideration of naturally occurring phenomena and thus is not patentable. In particular, Applicant is attempting to preempt the function(s) of the Food and Drug Administration by attempting to obtain a patent for analyzing drug interactions.

## Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225

Application/Control Number: 10/081,705

Art Unit: 2161

USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPO 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 201 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of U.S. Patent No 6,219,674 (Classen). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because elements of claim 201 of instant application are fully covered by claim 15 of US Pat No 6,219,674.

Claim 15 of U.S. Patent No 6,219,674 (Classen) contains every element of claim 201 of instant application and thus anticipates the claim of the instant application. Claim(s) of the instant application therefore is/are not patentably distinct from the earlier patent claim(s) and as such is unpatentable over obvious-type double patenting. A later patent/application claim is not patently distinct from an earlier filed claim if the claim is anticipated by the earlier claim.

## Instant Application:

Claim 201 recites:

A method for using data associated with at least one dataset, wherein essential adverse event information is stored, and

wherein the data is derived from an analysis of data from at least one adverse event data source of previously gathered data, and

Application/Control Number: 10/081,705 Page 5

Art Unit: 2161

identifies at least one new useful characteristic or use for a product or device responsive to identification of at least one new essential adverse event associated therewith, wherein the database comprises stored essential adverse event information, and wherein the adverse event information includes the at least one new use or characteristic,

said method comprising commercializing new essential adverse event information stored therein.

## US Pat No 6,219,674:

Claim 15 recites:

15. A method for creating and using product data, said method comprising the steps of:

accessing at least one adverse event data source that stores adverse event data associated with a commercially available product;

analyzing said adverse event data to identify new adverse events associated with the product;

creating at least one adverse event information database, said creating comprising analyzing data from said at least one adverse event data source to identify at least one new use for the product responsive to identification of at least one new adverse event associated with the product, said creating further comprising storing adverse event information, said adverse event information including said at least one new use; and

commercializing adverse event information stored at said at least one adverse event information database.

Response to Arguments

Application/Control Number: 10/081,705

Art Unit: 2161

Page 6

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 201-246 have been considered but are moot

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Examiner reviewed applicant's arguments regarding

the double-patenting rejection but was not persuaded.

**Contact Information** 

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Etienne P. LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022.

The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 am and 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Etienne LeRoux

8/17/2006

Ellhoux Primary Examiner